We did not take with us tuxedos or dress clothes. We did not see the bright lights. In fact, we went to many places in South America where there was no electricity, including a trip more than 800 miles up the Amazon River into the interior of the continent.

In 1959 I was honored by appointment by the then Vice President, Mr. Nixon, to speak at the dedication ceremonies of some of our American military cemeteries in France, north Africa, and Italy, where I served in World War II.

While I was there I made many observations. More recently, I was appointed to the Inter-Parliamentary Commonwealth Conference in London, to serve as an observer. While in Europe, following the conference in London, I spent time on the Continent in various countries. Wherever I went I observed a great many relaxed Americans on the public payroll, feeding at the public trough, and in many instances living "high on the hog." This situation was particularly true among foreign aid program personnel and in the oversea Central Intelligence Agency operations.

I wish to address myself this morning to the subject of relaxed Americans. The American traveling abroad will be amazed and perhaps angered at the multiplicity of officials, advisers, observers, consultants, and other representatives of our country who are to be found in every corner of the globe. As a result of my investigations and study both here in Washington, and the world over, I intend to scrutinize most carefully the appropriations and the authorizations that come before us. I am certainly in favor of foreign assistance, and I realize the necessity of assisting our allies and friends. I am a great believer in the alliance for progress that has been inaugurated and which recently celebrated its first birthday.

I believe that this program will be one of the great achievements of a great administration. We have too long neglected our Central and South American neighbors. The good-neighbor policy of Secretary of State Cordell Hull in the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration was disregarded and virtually abandoned in the crucial 8 years from 1953 to 1961.

Commencing on January 21, 1961, the situation changed. We are proceeding with urgency in a policy of cooperation with the republics south of the border. I feel that I greatly profited as a result of the study mission of 26 days in South America. We must proceed with greater urgency in lifting this program off the ground and getting it going without further delay.

Time was when American officialdom in foreign nations consisted solely of embassy and consular personnel. Now, in addition, we have the U.S. Information Agency—USIA, the Agency for International Development—AID, and so forth. The AID Agency should receive, in particular, the closest scrutiny not only from members of the Appropriations Committee, but of all Senators, because our taxpayers are sweating and sweating to pay for the tremendous expenditures involved in the AID program.

We have delegations to all sorts of international organizations, and representatives from virtually every Federal agency serving on special missions of one kind or another abroad. Then, in addition, we seem to have military missions in almost every nation. Wherever an American travels anywhere overseas, he finds military missions in almost every nation. In fact, I know of no nation where we do not have one.

In various cities of South America and the Far East I experienced wonderment at the huge number of relaxed Americans on the Federal payroll. Many of them, particularly in our foreign aid program, which in the Eisenhower administration was termed ICA—International Cooperation Administration—and before that the Mutual Security Agency, appear to be living "high on the hog." Their salaries and fringe benefits are excellent, and their social life seems to be very active.

The U.S. Information Agency has over 8,000 officials and employees overseas and nearly 3,000 within the United States. In the aid program there are over 6,000 officials and employees abroad and another 2,200 here at home. The State Department employs approximately 24,000 persons, over 16,000 of them in our embassies and consulates abroad.

It is a fact that there are many, many dedicated, hard working Americans serving overseas for our State Department and the various initialed agencies. It is difficult to keep track of all these alphabetical agencies. However, if the trend continues, if we disregard the huge expenditures or fail to scrutinize them very carefully, and if we do not try conscientiously to reduce them, I feel we shall soon be able to lump all of these agencies into one big agency called I O U.

It is my conviction—and I am sure this view is shared by many persons in the Government, that at least 10 percent of our employees abroad could be and should be eliminated. Not only would this result in a saving of taxpayers' money, but undoubtedly these agencies would function better. It would be a good idea if the top officials of these agencies would adopt a policy of gradual attrition regarding these relaxed Americans. When resignations and retirements occur, such vacancies should go unfilled unless it is determined in individual cases by a top-level departmental committee that this would impair or prejudice governmental functions. I would urge that this procedure be carried on until the personnel of these agencies had been reduced by 10 percent.

Mr. President, a tremendously important but probably overstaffed governmental agency is the Central Intelligence Agency with offices in Washington and a huge headquarters complex across the Potomac River staffed with thousands of officials. The main function of many of these officials seems to be to send communications to each other.

Beside the thousands of CIA officials and employees in Washington and vicinity, there are, of course, many more thousands of intelligence agents, employees, officials, and technical men and women, functioning throughout the world. This is an extremely important Agency of our Government. Nevertheless, George Dixon, famed Washington columnist and author, is so right when he recently wrote:

> CIA has so many employees now it has had to stagger working hours so our spies won't paralyze traffic on the Potomac bridges.

The total number of CIA employees has not been disclosed. Of course we know that they are working in practically every country of the world, as they should be, rendering an important service.

However, may I cite a personal observation in one of our embassies in a Central American country, which I visited late in the Eisenhower administration. In November or December of 1959, an economy program had been instituted, under which a 10-percent cut in employment in the various embassies had been ordered. The Ambassador apologized to me because there were only two automobiles in service in that embassy, and told me of a particular incident with a feeling of shame. On orders from Washington a CIA agent was assigned to his embassy. Here was an embassy which was short of automobiles, with only two old ones available for its use. It was also short of personnel by reason of the reduction in force order and was compelled to discharge two loyal employees, natives of the country. It was a matter of great regret to the Ambassador that he had to do this. He felt their discharge would make for a great deal of adverse feeling toward us in that country.

On the same day that he was compelled by orders from Washington to let these employees go, he had to place the CIA official on his staff as a clerk. This official was pretty far down on the totem pole, so to speak, the seventh or ninth employee on the Embassy staff. This CIA agent, who was supposed to be employed as an obscure clerk in the Embassy, arrived with a 1960 Chrysler automobile. Not only that, but he brought his secretary along, and she had a late model Chevrolet. These two new automobiles made a sudden appearance at the Embassy, which up to this time had only two old cars. The Ambassador stated to me:

> The officials of the Soviet Embassy are not exactly stupid. That's a giveaway. It is so obvious to anyone. I don't like it.

It is instances such as this that call for greater congressional control over this vital Agency.

The total number of CIA employees has not been disclosed. There are at present at least 3,000 employees at the new CIA headquarters at McLean, Va., according to an official of the Soviet Embassy in Washington, who readily answered questions put to him. I am sure that you and I, Mr. President, would not undertake to answer such questions, and we could not answer them. But the question was put to the Soviet Embassy official, and, according to George Dixon, the official stated that the number is now 3,000 and will be increased to 11,000. For the sake of the taxpayers, let us hope

that the Soviet Union is wrong once again.

The CIA is our most hush-hush Agency, as it should be. Everything about it is kept undercover. The nature of its operations requires this. Taxpayers are paying many millions of dollars for the maintenance of this vital Agency and are entitled, at least, to reliable assurance that the money for the CIA is at all times being spent wisely.

Seven years ago the Hoover Commission recommended a joint Senate-House watchdog committee for the CIA, but primarily because officials of the CIA itself opposed it, this recommendation was never implemented. We hope that the thousands of employees of the Central Intelligence Agency are doing the work they are supposed to do and are performing their important duties in a superior manner in this grim period of international anarchy.

We want CIA employees to perform their important duties in a satisfactory manner, but we, the elected representatives of the people, have no way of being assured of this fact. To the contrary, over the past 2 years we have seen ample evidence to cause us to doubt the efficiency and good judgment of employees and officials of the CIA. I would rather not go into detail. I am sure all Senators know the things to which I am referring, but to which at this time we would prefer to give the charity of our silence. But we have reason to doubt the past performance of officials and employees of the CIA and to question whether they showed good judgment.

Congress should have at least some watchdog authority over the CIA, not only because of the taxpayers' money involved, but because the competence of this agency and of the people it employs is vital to our national security.

Mr. President, the problem of overemployment in the Federal Government is a nagging one, one which continuously plagues us. It should be dealt with drastically at all levels in every Government department. With our foreign assistance programs coming under ever-increasing criticism, we must be constantly vigilant in dealing with problems involving agencies which handle oversea commitments. I refer to the ever-increasing criticism which is coming from our constituents. We should pay heed to their criticisms, because it appears to me that many of them have justification. The heads of these agencies should take immediate action to put their agencies above reproach in this regard. They should start by reducing unnecessary personnel working abroad who are living well at the expense of American taxpayers.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

## MORE ADEQUATE AUTHORIZATION FOR NATIONWIDE FOREST SURVEY

Mr. STENNIS. Madam President, my remarks this morning will be a continuation of the remarks made heretofore with reference to the supposed motion which is intended to be made, should the resolution be taken up, to offer as an amendment to the then pending resolution a proposed constitutional amendment. Before I discuss that, I wish briefly to discuss some matters extraneous to the subject.

Madam President, on behalf of myself and my colleagues from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide more adequate authorization for the nationwide forest survey which is conducted by the Forest Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3064) to amend section 9 of the act of May 22, 1928, as amended, authorizing and directing a national survey of forest resources, introduced by Mr. STENNIS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. STENNIS. Madam President, the bill would amend the McSweeney-McNary Forest Research Act of 1928 by eliminating from section 9 of the act the limitation on annual appropriations for resurveys.

The forest survey provides an inventory of our forest land and timber resources. It provides the basic facts on the extent and condition of forest land in all parts of our Nation such as the rate at which new forest land is added due to tree planting of fields taken out of agriculture, and the rate at which land is taken out of forest production for reservoirs, highways, and agriculture. Of even greater importance, the survey provides the facts on volume and quality of timber and the rate at which timber is growing or is being depleted by industrial use. The forest survey serves a very practical and significant purpose. It provides the essential information needed by industry on the timber raw material supply by region, State, and locality. Our forest products industries, as a group, are the fourth largest in the Nation. Therefore, they contribute heavily to the welfare of our country's economy. Industrial expansion and the future of our forest products industries in turn depends heavily upon this nationwide forest inventory being kept up to date.

The trouble now is that it is impossible for the Forest Service to keep this forest inventory sufficiently up to date to satisfy the need and the great demand for it. The present ceiling of $1,500,000 annually was established by the Congress in 1949. Since that time, costs of the forest survey have risen substantially. Our proposed bill would remove the ceiling and permit appropriation of funds as needed to keep the forest survey up to date.

The program about which I have spoken is one of the instances in which money appropriated by the Federal Government will be returned manifold to the public treasury because of the increased yield, and therefore the increased money return from the national forests due to the good management and businesslike disposition of the forest products that go into the markets of the Nation.

In amount of money the program is relatively small, but it is highly essential that we have the proposed surveys and, for the reasons assigned, the present sum allowed by law is not sufficient.

## RETIREMENT OF RICHARD E. McARDLE, CHIEF OF THE U.S. FOREST SERVICE

Mr. STENNIS. Madam President, on March 17 Richard E. McArdle retired as Chief of the Forest Service in the U.S. Department of Agriculture. I believe we should acknowledge as a matter of record the outstanding contribution of Dr. McArdle's 39 years in the Forest Service to the forest conservation programs of this country. Indeed, if it were not for his tireless efforts over the years the forests of this Nation would not be in the condition we find them today, as the mainstay of all our natural resources.

I have a great personal interest in Dr. McArdle's career because of my close association with forestry over the years. Forests provide the raw material for a major industry in my State and I have been close to the development of this activity. Also, I have been closely associated with many forestry matters considered by the Congress. In 1953, I was appointed to the National Forest Reservation Commission—a post I still hold today—and became acquainted with Dr. McArdle, then in his second year as head of the Forest Service. We got to know each other well through the work of this Commission and my personal interest in the forest resources of the Nation. I consider my association with him one of the finest experiences I have had with a career employee in the Government. He truly exemplifies the best in career service in Government today.

During Dr. McArdle's 10-year service as Chief he built a strong organization of forestry research scientists—strong in their skills and strong in their dedication to the difficult tasks they face. A great deal of competence has been brought together in the Forest Service's national forest and State and private forestry organizations, too. In fact, under Dr. McArdle's stimulating guidance, the Service has become noted for its competence and its highly skilled people. This achievement will last a long time and is certainly one of Dr. McArdle's greatest contributions.

As head of his agency, Dr. McArdle has established a national reputation for leadership and foresight in the careful planning of forestry programs under his responsibility. The development program for the national forests sent the Congress last year by the President is an example of a well planned and coordinated program to make these val-

One of the more improbable of these Kennedy-O'Brien gestures involved Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD, whose flamboyant failure to endorse Kennedy in 1960 clinched Virginia for Nixon, and whose contempt for anything but the most conservative policies is classic. But one Sunday last May when the Senator, a month before his 74th birthday, was giving a big luncheon for friends at his country estate, who should helicopter out of the sky but the President himself. The old Virginia gentleman was beside himself with pride and joy.

"Don't jump to conclusions," warned a liberal Senator later, "HARRY BYRD still opposes us. We'll never get his vote. But he's not sitting up nights now figuring out ways to be mean."

The conquest of CARL VINSON, Georgia's prestigious chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, was more complete. Republicans mutter darkly that VINSON's surprisingly enthusiastic support of the Kennedy 1961 program—often carrying other southern votes with him—might have been more surprising or less enthusiastic but for the award of a billion-dollar Air Force contract for jet transports to the Lockheed plant at Marietta, Ga., a year ago.

O'Brien dismisses this with a snort as innuendo. He says the true reason for VINSON's support is the simple fact that when John F. Kennedy was serving in the House, his office was near VINSON's and the two used to walk to the Chamber together; the venerable southerner took a liking to the boyish Yankee and it has flowered into a fruitful political relationship between two vastly different but loyal Democrats—though the fight over the B–70 bomber has strained that relationship.

O'Brien keeps a card index of congressional whims, interests and voting records. With elections in the offing, he is delicately but unmistakably making clear to the Democratic National Committee and the campaign committees of both Houses that the White House has an interest—sometimes maybe even a controlling interest—in the funds dispensed to candidates for office. He has coordinated the politically significant functions of the executive branch to an astonishing degree. He has trained Cabinet and agency liaison officers to alert him on their projects, problems—and potential vacancies.

Not only intelligence but policy has been coordinated. At first, departments and the White House often reflected different versions on the Hill. Now the word is "the President's policy is our policy and the President's priority is our priority.

Behind him, O'Brien has the support, confidence and authority of the President. "You know what I went," his unspoken orders run. "Come as close to it as you can." After a decade of working closely with him, O'Brien does know what the President wants. In the tense, ticklish process of trading votes to unblock a bill, he knows how much the President is prepared to change or dilute.

O'Brien's attitudes are conditioned by his deep conviction that the President—only 6 weeks older than himself—has a capacity for greatness which he wants to help him realize. A Catholic who experienced the bitter anti-Irish feelings of western Massachusetts as he grew up, O'Brien knows the meaning of the term "minority group." But though his personal politics have evolved as moderately liberal, he sees himself as a kind of human bridge between the party's Old Guard and the New Frontier.

His approach has already assisted him across a moat of cold aloofness into a friendly working contact with the intricate personality of the new Speaker. Their relationship helps counterbalance the longstanding coolness between MCCORMACK and the President. This stems from past clashes in Massachusetts politics. Last year there was added strain from the issue of funds for parochial schools and their currently "correct" relationship is shadowed by the apparent inevitability of an open clash between the Speaker's nephew, State Attorney General Edward McCormack, whom he loves like a son, and the President's youngest brother, Ted, both of whom covet the Massachusetts Democratic senatorial nomination.

But O'Brien must concentrate his sharpest attention on the big show in the main tent. It will take all the talents he can muster to rally the leadership and the rank and file to make satisfactory legislative progress, especially to hoist into place the keystone of Mr. Kennedy's 1962 international design—a revolutionary trade bill to provide a way for the American and European economies to combine their strengths and flourish together.

The deepest trouble is not in the Senate. There, under the gentle but insistent hand of Majority Leader MANSFIELD, the Democrats can quite consistently manage to put together administration majorities. The deepest trouble is in the House, whose Members, in the acid words of one White House aid, have shown a capacity to perform "with about as much discipline as a bunch of Baluba tribesmen." A rightwing coalition of midwest Republicans and southern Democrats dominates the House. To win, the administration needs liberal Republican votes, but the sharp whipcracking of Minority Leader CHARLES HALLECK, a veteran of political infighting, can make this extremely difficult.

Whether the administration has begun this session with the right strategy is a matter of debate in Washington. It has already suffered a major defeat: congressional veto of the President's plan to add a Cabinet post for urban affairs with a Negro, Dr. Robert C. Weaver, now Chief of the Federal Housing Agency, as its first head. How effectively the issue can be raised to haunt Republicans in the big cities and among urban Negro voters—where Richard Nixon lost in 1960—remains to be seen.

But O'Brien knew from the outset that nothing would move easily, that success on major measures like trade liberalization and "medicare" for the aged would require fighting every inch of the way.

Larry O'Brien is, obviously, a political realist; like his chief, he believes that politics is the art of the possible. Son of a Springfield, Mass., hotelkeeper, he grew up in the turbulence of Massachusetts politics, joined forces with Congressman John F. Kennedy in his first run for the Senate in 1952 and has been sharing—and helping to enrich—the dazzling Kennedy political fortunes ever since. To the roots of his crewcut red hair, O'Brien's very being seems to throb with the pulse of politics.

A politician learns early that privacy is a luxury he can rarely afford, but O'Brien attempts to reserve Sunday afternoons for long walks along the old canal edging the Potomac or through Dumbarton Oaks, a lovely park near his home. He is usually accompanied on these sorties by Mrs. O'Brien, their 3-year-old Chesapeake retriever, named Jefferson-Jackson, and 16-year-old Larry Jr., who, though his father thinks he has a flair for journalism, is determined at this point to go into politics.

O'Brien's taste in literature is "relatively light stuff—blood-and-guts novels, including detective stories." He likes to catch a movie now and then but he almost never can make a favorite on its first run. Though he and the President are dedicated to each other, it does not seem strange to O'Brien that he does not travel with the egghead and society set to nonpolitical White House soirees. The two men don't discuss books or plays. They discuss their mutual interest, politics.

While legislators can be found who don't like O'Brien, their peeves are often variations of that well-known political aria, "Yes, but what have you done for me lately?" On the whole, the chorus of praise is hearty.

"Frankly," confides a Cabinet officer reared in the rough-and-tumble of State politics, "he is the very best of the White House pros. There are always a hell of a lot of idea guys available but the Larrys are hard to find. He knows that ideas are fine but that they're no damn good unless they can be translated into action."

An O'Brien aid puts it this way: "He has a great sixth sense of judging the change in a man as the situation changes. He understands that everybody is different and every congressional district has different problems. He knows that every Member of Congress tailors his vote this way: 'What does it mean to me?'"

There are New Frontiersmen, even in the White House, who feel the administration's pitch concentrates too narrowly on Congress, that the President should carry the issues more frequently to the people and build up pressure on the legislators in their home constituencies. O'Brien's answer is this:

"These Senators and Representatives, for better or worse, are here as elected representatives of the people and you've got to deal with them. Fireside chats are all right, but it's the intimate contact with Congress that really counts.

"Why does a Congressman vote the way he does? Of course he is vitally interested in the effect on his district but—and this may sound naive—I am convinced he considers the national interest, too. He travels both roads."

One of O'Brien's toughest tasks is to convince the legislator that the two roads converge. "You can't ask a Congressman to commit hara-kari," he tells his staff. "Never try to 'con' a Member. Try to persuade him on the basis of the facts. Try to convince him that if he votes with us he won't get as much flak as he feared."

O'Brien's easy, friendly, but respectful approach is illustrated by a happening last January. As a kind of ceremonial exercise, Minority Leader HALLECK ran for the speakership against MCCORMACK, whose hallowed trappings of seniority and record of hard work made the outcome never in doubt. After the doughty Indianian had been beaten—248 to 166—he got a call from the White House. "I hope," chuckled Larry O'Brien, "that you'll let us win another one."

Both men knew that that first ritualistic decision of the session would be the last without a real contest, and they prepared in the good-natured grimness of politics to go to work—on each other.

## RELAXED AMERICANS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I wish to comment on the foreign assistance program of the present administration. I feel that our President and the administration are deserving of credit for giving the program its proper name. When I first became a Member of the Senate, following the election of 1958, in the closing years of the Eisenhower administration, the program was called the mutual security program. It is properly termed a foreign assistance program. I am happy to see the present frankness and honesty to the American people.

Mr. President, I wish to say that I have had occasion to participate in study missions in the Far East, and more recently in a 26-day study mission in South America with three of my colleagues.

bill then these countries will preserve their independence, the poverty and unemployment in these unfortunate places will be cured, and we will assure ourselves victory over communism.

This is not merely nonsense but a very dangerous illusion. It raises hopes beyond any possible chance of fulfillment, as anyone will know who reflects on the billions of foreign aid paid out over 15 years and the state of the world today. In Laos and Vietnam, for example, foreign aid has made hardly a dent in deep-rooted poverty and the security of their independence is today as precarious as ever.

How illusory these oversold promises are becomes especially clear in the reports from Latin America by our Mr. Evans, currently appearing on this page. The poverty and backwardness of some of these countries is thoroughly documented; so is the danger of Communist infiltration, some of it growing out of that poverty and backwardness. To this extent, the picture painted by Washington is not overdrawn.

Yet it is something else again to pretend that the magic cure is a mammoth injection of U.S. dollars. Or that a dollar spent for foreign aid serves equally to defend us as a dollar spent upon our own defenses. Or that if Congress curtails the administration's program the want of a dollar will be the cause of chaos and communism.

It shouldn't be necessary for us to say, although it probably is, that we are not opposed to foreign aid as such. Fifteen years ago this newspaper supported the program for Greece and Turkey, and encouraged the objectives of the Marshall plan in Europe. There are many ways today in which American aid can be effective both in helping other countries and in promoting our own interests.

It is the oversell of the program that is largely responsible for its scandals of waste and corruption abroad and the growing disillusionment with it at home. Worse, these things have combined to diminish its effectiveness. And worst of all, the American people are thus deprived of the sensible discussion that is essential if we are to act wisely in apportioning our efforts and our resources.

All this is as true of the tariff bill, or of medical and educational programs, as it is of foreign aid. Perhaps it is good politics for the administration to argue for every road or school appropriation on the ground, in Mr. Reston's phrase that "failure to build them will mean the triumph of communism for the next 100 years." But exaggerated promises and appeals to fear suggest a poverty of political leadership.

## LAWRENCE O'BRIEN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the New York Times of March 25, 1962, there appears an article by Edward P. Morgan entitled "O'Brien Presses On With the 'Four P's'." It is a study of Lawrence O'Brien, Special Assistant to the President for Congressional Affairs, better known to all of us as Larry O'Brien. It is an excellent article, Mr. President, and I would add to it only this: In the 20 years that I have been in Congress, I have never known a more effective Presidential representative on the Hill than Larry O'Brien. He understands the Congress as well as the needs of the Presidency and he has blended this knowledge into a conduct of his office which serves both the President and the Congress and, most of all, the interests of the people of the United States. He is the right man, in the right job, at the right time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article previously referred to be included at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

O'BRIEN PRESSES ON WITH THE "FOUR P'S"

(By Edward P. Morgan)

WASHINGTON.—In its first year, the Kennedy administration did surprisingly well in getting what it wanted on Capitol Hill—partly because it carefully did not ask too controversial a package. Congress passed a huge housing bill, approved a rise in the minimum wage, and voted extensive foreign aid.

This year promises to be different. The President has a much more ambitious program that he wants to get through Congress—and it is going to face recalcitrance if not hostility. Take, first, the bundle of priority bills for 1962: trade, medical care, tax reform, welfare, aid to higher education—every item is controversial. Second, these matters are of more concern to city than country populations, more national than sectional in interest, more liberal than conservative in tone. The task is to try to move this bundle through a Congress which is more conservative than liberal, more sectional than national in outlook and disproportionately dominated (especially in the House) by rural rather than by urban voters.

A formidable challenge in any session, this combination is even tougher now because 1962 is a non-Presidential election year in which the opposition traditionally gains seats in Congress. Such prospects make Congress more restive, more sensitive to local demands over national responsibility. Add the fact that the carrot of patronage was largely consumed last session and that in order to apply the stick deftly, the White House must work with a new—and so far bumbling—House leadership and cultivate new intelligence sources. That is a working outline of the administration's problem.

There are, of course, weighty factors on the White House side—the President's very high popular standing, his strong political prestige, his personal persuasive powers. The trick is to bring these factors to bear in the right place and at the right time as the new legislation comes up. And the key man in this tactical maneuver is Lawrence Francis O'Brien, the amiable, chunky, 44-year-old Special Assistant to the President for Congressional Affairs. Put more succinctly, he is the lobbyist for the White House on Capitol Hill, and he shows signs of becoming the ablest man in the job in years.

O'Brien prefers persuasion to playing tough. He believes the full facts on a bill can often be most persuasive in dispelling a Congressman's doubts and fears about it.

O'Brien's own zestful capacity for work seems, like his boss', inexhaustible. After checking the New York Times, the Wall Street Journal and the Washington Post at breakfast at home in Georgetown (where he and his wife Elva often entertain informally), he usually reaches his office shortly after 8 a.m., nearly an hour before the secretaries are due.

Depending on the urgency of legislation, President Kennedy may call him in once, twice, three times a day for consultation. They have no special schedule. "When you need him, you see him," O'Brien has said. "It's a total access kind of thing." Interspersed, with lunch on the fly, are long conferences on Capitol Hill with Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, Senate Whip HUBERT HUMPHREY, House Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK, House Majority Leader CARL ALBERT, House Whip HALE BOGGS, and assorted lobbyists.

If it's a Monday, it's time by late afternoon for O'Brien to pore over the 10-page memo compiled by assistant Claude J. Desautels from the weekly reports of Cabinet liaison officers. This goes to the President as the core of his intelligence for his Tuesday breakfast discussions with the party leadership. Often Mr. Kennedy likes to talk politics at the end of the day. It's a rare occasion when O'Brien's main workload is dispatched before mid-evening.

How does a White House lobbyist operate? What are his weapons? O'Brien's arsenal comprises, basically, the "four P's": Pressure, Patronage, Prestige, and Personal Contact.

He ranks the last first, on the proved theory that successful politics is a matter of personal relations. He knows everybody and his brother. He is aware of their problems and alert to their ambitions. He senses when he can trade a favor for a vote.

One of his most precious tools is an intangible one: the prestige of the Presidency. Instinctively, most legislators don't like to clash with the White House—especially when the Chief Executive is strong and popular.

O'Brien is playing to the hilt the remarkable rise in Mr. Kennedy's public popularity over the past year. All but a score of Democratic Congressmen had led the President in their districts in the 1960 voting. Thus their mood a year ago was one of "he needs us more than we need him." Now many Congressmen are having second thoughts about who needs them. Yet this is a fragile bond, easily broken.

If it falls, and if the issue is sufficiently critical, the heavy artillery of pressure and patronage will then be wheeled up. Sometimes patronage is more damaging when withheld than helpful when proffered. During the 1961 fight on foreign aid, one Congressman threatened to hamstring the bill if he didn't get a veterans' hospital for his district. He didn't—it was rejected as unsound—and he helped push the amendment which killed the President's key request for long-term borrowing authority. "The decision against the hospital," O'Brien said later, "was still right."

The pleas of favor-seekers rain down constantly on the White House and most of them find their way to O'Brien's handsome wood-paneled suite on the second floor of the Executive Wing. About 150 telephone calls alone come in daily from officeholders, office-seekers, State chairmen and plain citizens asking for Larry. No request, whether involving a dam or a White House tour, goes unacknowledged.

"We're digging in hard for you," O'Brien's able House liaison chief, a lanky North Carolina lawyer named Henry Hall Wilson, drawled to a Congressman on the phone recently. "We'll surely try to work it. We're for you."

Wilson, like his wise, Wyoming-born opposite number for Senate liaison, Mike N. Manatos, patronage specialist Richard K. Donahue and the whole staff is finely trained in the O'Brien technique of avoiding out-of-hand rejection of congressional supplicants, if possible. "It's a hell of a damaging blow to a Congressman," one aide reflects, "to have to confess to a constituent with a pet project or a bothersome brother-in-law wanting a job that he hasn't enough influence even to get 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue to place it under advisement. But if he can honestly report it's 'under active consideration,' it may ease him off the hook."

Little kindnesses, common courtesies, dispensed under the magnifying magic of Presidential prestige, can do wonders to encourage congressional help. Not everybody can be budged. Nothing, for example, could deflect Louisiana Congressman OTTO PASSMAN from his one-man war against foreign aid. But O'Brien's personal thoughtfulness, coupled with the President's own winning personality and studied respect for his elders, has had astonishing results, especially with the southerners.

MEMORANDUM FOR: THE DIRECTOR

For information only. Attached is an extract from today's Congressional Record where Senator Young of Ohio complains about too many people at overseas posts and particularly discusses CIA people both abroad and here. A copy has been sent to DD/P for their information.

25X1

25X1

JOHN S. WARNER
Legislative Counsel
(DATE)
27 March 1962

3 APR 1962

FORM NO. 1 AUG 54 101 REPLACES FORM 10-101 WHICH MAY BE USED. (47)